

The
WHITE PINE
SERIES OF
Architectural Monographs
Volume VI *Number 4*

**DESIGNS FOR A
ROADSIDE TAVERN**
To be built of
WHITE PINE


With report of the Jury of Architects
Cass Gilbert: Howard Shaw
Chas. Z Klauder: F.R. Walker
R. Clipston Sturgis

7355271 (H.V.)

Copyright, 1920
GEORGE F. LINDSAY, *Chairman*
WHITE PINE BUREAU
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA



1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920



An Architectural MONOGRAPH

on a

ROADSIDE TAVERN

To be built of White Pine

Competition Drawings

With report of the Jury of Architects


Cass Gilbert: Howard Shaw

Chas. Z. Klauder: F. R. Walker

R. Clipston Sturgis

*Prepared for Publication by
Russell F. Whitehead formerly Editor
of The Architectural Record
and The Brickbuilder
132 Madison Ave. New York N.Y.*

1920



FIRST PRIZE DESIGN

Submitted by Joseph Hudnut and Carl D. Montgomery, New York, N. Y.

The WHITE PINE SERIES of ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS

A BI-MONTHLY PUBLICATION SUGGESTING THE
ARCHITECTURAL USES OF WHITE PINE AND ITS
AVAILABILITY TODAY AS A STRUCTURAL WOOD

Vol. VI

AUGUST, 1920

No. 4

A ROADSIDE TAVERN

REPORT OF THE JURY OF AWARD OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL
WHITE PINE ARCHITECTURAL COMPETITION

Judged at the Biltmore, New York, N. Y., May 14 and 15, 1920

PROBLEM: The design of a roadside tavern, to be built of White Pine, which is for all year round use, and which is to include a restaurant, and living quarters for the people who run it. The requirements are as follows: A dining-room, area 750 square feet, and of such shape that the removal of tables would permit it to be used for dancing; men's dining-room, area 200 square feet; private dining-room, area 175 square feet; private dining-room, area 100 square feet; reception-room, area 250 square feet; adequate lavatories and toilet-rooms for both men and women; kitchen and service portion, area 500 square feet; chauffeurs' dining-room, area 150 square feet; living-room for proprietor's family, area 300 square feet; two main bedrooms, area 225 square feet each, and one bath; four servants' bedrooms, area 80 square feet each, and one bath; a space for the sale of candies and soft drinks, area 125 square feet, with direct access from the highway. These rooms may be disposed in one, two, or three stories, as the competitor may elect. Floor heights should not be less than 8 feet, nor exceed 12 feet. Cellar will be required for heating purposes only, and need not be indicated on drawings. No piazzas other than an entrance porch are required. The problem shall include a layout of the plot indicated herewith, showing development of the property as a whole. The competitor shall design an appropriate hanging sign for the entrance, which, drawn at a scale of $\frac{1}{2}$ inch to the foot, shall be his *nom de plume* or device. The architectural style is optional.

THE problem presented in the Fifth Annual Architectural Competition conducted by THE WHITE PINE SERIES OF ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS involved a study of a Roadside Tavern, and its grounds, and the Jury of Award, in making its decisions, considered the general layout, the plan of the building to meet the needs of guests, and the character of the building within and without as designed to attract the motoring public, not only to stop, but to return.

A hundred designs were submitted, and the members of the Jury were almost overwhelmed with the very large number which were good—so good that they could not be readily or quickly eliminated. It is one of the most encouraging indications of the progress of architecture in this country to find in a general competition of this kind such a very large number of good designs. Older members of the profession, who look back twenty-five or thirty years, can see the very extraordinary advance not only in draughtsmanship but in thoughtful, intelligent design that has marked these years. Men who

could render as well as half of these hundred competitors were rare and eagerly sought after simply as renderers. Men who could design with the head as well as the hands were rarer still in architects' offices. In the last analysis, a large number of the designs may be fairly looked upon as worthy of any of the best offices in the country. It is more and more borne in upon the architects of the country that however much they may themselves contribute to the training of their draughtsmen, it is the draughtsmen themselves who make a very substantial contribution to the reputation of the office in which they work, and the Jury wishes to take this opportunity of emphasizing and acknowledging the debt which the architects owe to their draughtsmen. In architecture, more than in any other of the great arts, the best achievement is due to many minds working together, and no one man can claim credit for the masterpieces of architecture which have put this country in the forefront in architectural achievement.

The programme required that the tavern should contain rooms convenient for the enter-

tainment of the public for meals, but not for the night, and should have accommodations for motor cars and chauffeurs, for the servants of the tavern, and for the proprietor's family.







FIRST PRIZE DESIGN. The design placed first has a good general plan. The building, "L" shaped, is close to the road, thus wasting none of the small lot in space for motors to enter or park, and reserving the front on the stream and the apple orchard for the use of the guests. The entrances, both from the court and direct from the street, are well placed to serve the public rooms, the main dining-room occupying the best corner, while the service portion occupies the wing. The exterior expresses the character and the use of the building. Simple and dignified, it is yet distinctly a tavern and not a private house, and the use of differing materials on the outside expresses very cleverly the main public parlors and the service wing. The dining-room French windows open on the terrace, of which more might well have been made. The little shop is admirably located near the street and yet is a part of the composition. The detail sheet shows thorough understanding and both exterior and interior are charming, and though distinctly borrowed, are none the less evidences of judgment and good taste. Incidentally, one questions the use of large beams running lengthwise of the dining-room, but this perhaps is being hyper-critical of a design that is excellent and which would undoubtedly look better rather than worse in execution.

SECOND PRIZE DESIGN. The design placed second came very near that placed first, and perhaps the only reason for this order of one and two was the fact that each of the jurymen independently placed first the one awarded first place, and all independently placed this design second. Both, however, are very good, and this design has its special merits. The general plan lets motors through to the rear, but the guests are landed direct from the street, and no space is wasted. The orchard and stream are preserved for the enjoyment of the guests. All the dining-rooms face this pleasant outlook, and the proprietor's living-rooms are equally well taken care of. The exterior is good in character, simple but full of charm, with a delightful hooded entrance and a portico which connects the front with the dining-rooms at the rear. The interior is simple and dignified, and other details show a thorough knowledge of design. The wrought-iron work is well designed and judiciously used where it gives the best effect. The building as a whole is so planned as to be equally attractive from any approach.

THIRD PRIZE DESIGN. The design placed third is totally different in conception from either one or two, for the author has deliberately and very wisely taken advantage of the contours of the land, and utilized both the first floor and the basement for rooms looking out on the stream. The general plan is admirable. The building is set close to the road; the easy approach and the view of the building are so attractive as to demand immediate attention; but the approach from the other direction, which is not shown, is equally attractive, and is not the least interesting part of the plan. The two-story plan already referred to simplifies the concentration of service, and dining-rooms are well placed for convenience of service. The details of the designs placed first and second are excellent examples of thorough classical knowledge; the details here are equally convincing as examples of good use of the very simplest forms. The wise use of simple material and simple forms is another sign of good taste which is rapidly coming into popular favor. It is somewhat remarkable that a country like ours, new in matters of the Fine Arts, with little or no tradition and no great examples before us, should have so completely avoided the pitfalls of over-loaded ornament and of the straining after something new, which has injured the architecture of both France and England, and absolutely vulgarized any shred of good taste in Germany. The affectations of England and the "New Art" of France never have touched our architects, and we are today doing the most restrained and most conservative work. The third design shows this restraint.

FOURTH PRIZE DESIGN. The design placed fourth was so placed unanimously, and yet the Jury regretted that the terms prevented giving equal or almost equal recognition to another design. In fact, closely following the four leaders there were others who "also ran." The general plan of the fourth prize design is simple and straightforward. The building is placed frankly where it belongs, near the highway, and all the land behind and by the stream is reserved for the guests. The proprietor, rather than the guests, enjoys the outlook over the stream. However, the plan is good and logical, with the guests' portion in the centre, the service on one side and the proprietor on the other; the private dining-rooms are upstairs over the centre portion, with the servants' rooms also upstairs. The proprietor's bedrooms are isolated in the right-hand wing. The interior and exterior details are quiet and restrained, and show a thorough knowledge which is admirable.


(Continued on page twenty-four)




DESIGN for a WHITE PINE ROADSIDE TAVERN

FIRST PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet

Submitted by Joseph Hudnut and Carl D. Montgomery, New York, N. Y.




SECOND PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet
 Submitted by Robbins L. Conn, New York, N. Y.



SECOND FLOOR PLAN
MASTERS WING


PLAN OF FIRST FLOOR
W. Schickelbauer
SCALE FOR PLANS

SECOND FLOOR PLAN
SERVANTS WING




PLOT PLAN
SCALE

DESIGN
for
A WHITE PINE
ROADSIDE TAVERN




SECOND PRIZE DESIGN

Submitted by Robbins L. Conn, New York, N. Y.




THIRD PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet

Submitted by Thomas Bond Owings and Henry Herbert Dean, New York, N. Y.




Design
for
A WHITE PINE
ROADSIDE TAVERN




Plan of Main Floor

Scale for Plans




Plan of
Ground Floor



Plan of
Second Floor

THIRD PRIZE DESIGN





Submitted by Thomas Bond Owings and Henry Herbert Dean, New York, N. Y.



Design for a WHITE PINE Roadside Tavern

FOURTH PRIZE DESIGN, Detail Sheet


Submitted by P. Donald Horgan, William J. Mooney, and Harold A. Rich, Boston, Mass.



Design for a WHITE PINE Roadside Tavern


FOURTH PRIZE DESIGN


Submitted by P. Donald Horgan, William J. Mooney, and Harold A. Rich, Boston, Mass.



FIRST MENTION, Detail Sheet


Submitted by Richard M. Powers and Joseph G. McGann, Boston, Mass.






SECOND MENTION, Detail Sheet

Submitted by Atwell John King and Henry V. Capel, New York, N. Y.




SECOND MENTION

Submitted by Atwell John King and Henry V. Capel, New York, N. Y.




MENTION, Detail Sheet
Submitted by Donald Robb, Boston, Mass.





MENTION

Submitted by Donald Robb, Boston, Mass.




MENTION, Detail Sheet
Submitted by Bernhard Dirks, Chicago, Ill.







MENTION, Detail Sheet

Submitted by Wilmer Bruce Rabenold, New York, N. Y.



SUBMITTED BY



TURNPIKE


FIRST FLOOR PLAN

SECOND FLOOR PLAN

DESIGN FOR A WHITE PINE ROADSIDE TAVERN


MENTION

Submitted by Wilmer Bruce Rabenold, New York, N. Y.



MENTION, Detail Sheet

Submitted by R. J. Wadsworth, Philadelphia, Pa.



MENTION

Submitted by R. J. Wadsworth, Philadelphia, Pa.

The designs awarded mentions are all good, but two stand out a little apart from the others, and are so near the first four as to deserve special mention.

The First Mention has a good general plan, which places the building near the road, and reserves the stream and orchard for the guests of the tavern. The main building is rectangular in mass, with wings for dining-room, for service, and for the proprietor. Perhaps here is the one weak point, for the public dining-rooms are really the key-note of the tavern, and not an appendage. Apart from this, the general layout, the plan, and the elevations and details without and within are charming, and the rendering is such as we can all envy.

One may say here, perhaps, that throughout all the drawings there is a draughtsmanship which is most encouraging for the future of the draughtsmen. If we have such draughtsmanship as is shown in this competition, we may rest assured that the presentation of architectural designs will lose nothing in the rendering. While speaking of rendering, it is not out of place to refer also to lettering. All of this is good, and some of really unusual beauty, as for example that on the drawings given the fourth prize. Good lettering is, after all, the last word in

draughtsmanship. A man who can letter beautifully can draw anything.

The design given Second Mention has a general plan which sacrifices perhaps too much to the entrance, but is thoughtfully and well studied. The plan of the building is straightforward, simple, and convincing. The exterior is so quiet and so simple as to have the charm which goes with all restrained work, and the Jury feel that the simplicity of this design is a most hopeful sign of the general tendency toward appreciation of the beauty of proportion. The rear elevation was accidentally drawn the wrong way round, to speak colloquially. This, however, is a draughtsman's error, which happens in the best regulated offices.

The four designs given mentions are good, and each has so many assets as to make it rather invidious to attempt to rank them. There are good points and bad points in each, but all are creditable to those who presented them.

CASS GILBERT	} Jury of Award
CHAS. Z. KLAUDER	
HOWARD SHAW	
R. CLIPSTON STURGIS, <i>Chairman</i>	
F. R. WALKER	

VOLUMES V AND VI

THE WHITE PINE SERIES OF ARCHITECTURAL MONOGRAPHS

Vol. V, No. 1.	The Seventeenth Century Connecticut House	- - - -	-	Harold Donaldson Eberlein
Vol. V, No. 2.	Settlements on the Eastern End of Long Island	- - - -	-	William Edgar Moran
Vol. V, No. 3.	Historic Houses of Litchfield	- - - -	-	C. Matlack Price
Vol. V, No. 4.	Community Centre Building	- - - -	-	Report of Jury of Award
Vol. V, No. 5.	Old Chatham and Neighboring Dwellings South of the Berkshires	- - - -	-	Alwyn T. Covell
Vol. VI, No. 1.	The Boston Post Road	- - - -	-	Peter Augustus Pindar
Vol. VI, No. 2.	A New England Village	- - - -	-	Hubert G. Ripley
Vol. VI, No. 3.	The Wooden Architecture of the Lower Delaware Valley	- - - -	-	Jewett A. Grosvenor

List of Members of
**THE NORTHERN PINE MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION OF
 MINNESOTA, WISCONSIN AND MICHIGAN**

W. T. BAILEY LUMBER COMPANY	Virginia, Minn.
CLOQUET LUMBER COMPANY	Cloquet, Minn.
CROOKSTON LUMBER COMPANY	Bemidji, Minn.
DULUTH LOG COMPANY	Duluth, Minn.
JOHNSON-WENTWORTH COMPANY	Cloquet, Minn.
THE J. NEILS LUMBER COMPANY	Cass Lake, Minn.
NICHOLS-CHISHOLM LUMBER COMPANY	Frazee, Minn.
NORTHLAND PINE COMPANY	Minneapolis, Minn.
THE NORTHERN LUMBER COMPANY	Cloquet, Minn.
PINE TREE MANUFACTURING COMPANY	Little Falls, Minn.
RUST-OWEN LUMBER COMPANY	Drummond, Wis.
ST. CROIX LUMBER & MFG. COMPANY	Winton, Minn.
SHEVLIN-CLARKE COMPANY, LTD.	Fort Frances, Ont.
J. S. STEARNS LUMBER COMPANY	Odanah, Wis.
THE I. STEPHENSON COMPANY	Wells, Mich.
THE VIRGINIA & RAINY LAKE COMPANY	Virginia, Minn.

List of Members of
THE ASSOCIATED WHITE PINE MANUFACTURERS OF IDAHO

BLACKWELL LUMBER COMPANY	Coeur d' Alene, Idaho
BONNERS FERRY LUMBER COMPANY	Bonnors Ferry, Idaho
DOVER LUMBER COMPANY	Dover, Idaho
HUMBIRD LUMBER COMPANY	Sandpoint, Idaho
MCGOLDRICK LUMBER COMPANY	Spokane, Wash.
MILWAUKEE LAND COMPANY	St. Joe, Idaho
PANHANDLE LUMBER COMPANY	Spirit Lake, Idaho
POTLATCH LUMBER COMPANY	Potlatch, Idaho
ROSELAKE LUMBER COMPANY	Roselake, Idaho
EDWARD RUTLEDGE TIMBER COMPANY	Coeur d' Alene, Idaho
WINTON LUMBER COMPANY	Gibbs, Idaho

*Any information desired regarding White Pine will be furnished
 by any member of either Association or by the*

WHITE PINE BUREAU
Merchants Bank Building, Saint Paul, Minnesota

Representing
 The Northern Pine Manufacturers' Association of Minnesota, Wisconsin
 and Michigan and The Associated White Pine Manufacturers of Idaho

